Postal Services Continuation Act, 1987

Member spoke in favour of the back-to-work legislation? What kind of hypocrisy is that?

Mr. Nystrom: Who was that?

Mr. Keeper: George Baker. When the Liberal Party wants to be the defender of labour it puts up one Member to speak, and when they want to attack labour they put up another Member to speak. How can you trust that Party?

Mr. Nunziata: Where oh where is Ed Broadbent when you need him?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Get to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could we please extend some courtesy to the Hon. Member.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the legislation, but I do not want to forget the Liberal Party entirely.

Mrs. Mailly: Why not?

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Everyone else has.

Mr. Keeper: Because one of the weaknesses in this legislation is that it appoints someone called a mediator/arbitrator. Has that ever been done before?

Mr. Dick: Why not try something new?

Mr. Keeper: It is not new. The Conservatives are not the first ones to create this confusion. Who did it before? It was done once before and it was the Liberal Party who did it.

Mr. Nunziata: Shame on the Liberal Party.

Mr. Keeper: It is the Liberal Party attacking this legislation yet they set the precedent.

Mrs. Mailly: Beautiful!

Mr. Keeper: What kind of hypocrisy is that? The Liberal Party acts one way when it is in opposition and another way when it is in Government!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Mailly: Give the man a cigar.

Mr. Keeper: I must say that when I hear the Liberals speaking out of both sides of their mouths then I get angry. We are much more used to the vision of the Liberal Party as the mushy middle. That is the Party we can forget. That is the Party Canadians are forgetting. That is the Party that will not be a significant force in this country after the next election.

Mr. Caccia: We brought in collective bargaining long before you were born. Calm down.

Mr. Murphy: Yes, you voted in favour of the back-to-work legislation for the railway workers.

Mr. Keeper: One of my Liberal friends in defence of his Party says it is that Party that brought in labour legislation. Let us face it, in the past the Liberal Party has done some good things.

Mr. Riis: Name one.

Mr. Lewis: Name one.

Mr. Keeper: Let my friend tell me why his labour critic can get up in this House and defend labour at the same time another Member of his Party is saying they are going to vote for back-to-work legislation.

Mr. Lewis: They have always operated that way.

Mr. Keeper: How can they do that on the same day?

Mr. Caccia: It is not true.

Mr. Keeper: It is absolutely true and you will hear it on the program which was recorded today. It is on tape!

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask for your help to try and keep this debate on the rails. I thought what we had before us was legislation which I have my own personal difficulties with but I do not think the Hon. Member who has the floor now is sticking to the subject or is relevant.

An Hon. Member: It is very relevant.

Mr. Heap: Tell the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata).

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): The subject of the debate is not divisions between the Liberal Party and the NDP.

Mr. Lewis: We are prepared to listen to them on that, too.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): It is Bill C-86. I would like to see the Hon. Member stick to the Bill and I am requesting your help.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair finds that what the Hon. Member is saying is relevant to the Bill.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Liberal labour critic was not here when I pointed out that one of the weaknesses in this legislation is the confusion of the roles of mediator and arbitrator. He was not here when I pointed out that it was the Liberal Party that introduced that concept to labour legislation.

However, to set aside my concerns about the Liberal Party, because we have more important things to deal with, I will come to the legislation, Bill C-86.

The Government has introduced this back-to-work legislation and I want to know whether there was another way of handling the postal dispute. When the Minister introduced the Bill, he sought to give the impression that the Government's